



Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
600 Brickell Avenue | Miami, FL 33131 | tel 786.913.4900 | fax 786.913.4901

Geoffrey Sant
tel: 212.858.1162
geoffrey.sant@pillsburylaw.com

April 22, 2024

VIA ECF

The Honorable Katherine Polk Failla
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse
40 Foley Square, Room 2103
New York, NY 10007

MEMO ENDORSED

Re: *Huzhou Chuangtai Rongyuan Investment Management Partnership, et al. v. Hui Qin et al.*, Case No. 1:24-cv-02219-KPF (Related to Case No. 1:21-cv-09221-KPF) – **Plaintiffs’ Request for Leave to File A Document with Redactions**

Dear Judge Failla:

We write on behalf of Plaintiffs Huzhou Chuangtai Rongyuan Investment Management Partnership, Huzhou Huihengying Equity Investment Partnership, and Huzhou Huirongsheng Equity Investment Partnership (“Plaintiffs”) to request leave to file a document with redactions, pursuant to Rule 9(B) of Your Honor’s Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Cases and the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order dated January 3, 2023, Dkt. No. 92 (“Protective Order”) in *Huzhou Chuangtai Rongyuan Investment Management Partnership, et al. v. Hui Qin*, 1:21-cv-09221-KPF (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 8, 2021) (the “Related Case”).

In conjunction with Plaintiffs’ Reply in Support of the Motion for A Preliminary Injunction, filed contemporaneously herewith, Plaintiffs respectfully request to file the Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of their Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (the “Memorandum of Law”) with redactions pursuant to Rule 9(B) of Your Honor’s Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Cases and the Protective Order.

Pursuant to Rule 9 of Your Honor’s Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Cases, a party seeking to file a document with redactions must address the presumption in favor of public access to judicial documents. The Second Circuit set forth the relevant standard *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110 (2d Cir. 2006). Under *Lugosch*, “[t]here is a common law presumption in favor of permitting public access to judicial documents, which are those documents ‘relevant to the performance of the judicial function and useful in the judicial process.’” *GoSMiLE, Inc. v. Dr. Jonathan Levine, D.M.D. P.C.*, 769 F. Supp. 2d 630, 649 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (quoting *Lugosch*, 435 F.3d at 119). A court balances this common law presumption of access against competing comparisons, including “the privacy interests of those resisting disclosure.” *Lugosch*, 435 F.3d at

The Honorable Katherine Polk Failla

April 22, 2024

Page 2 of 2

120 (quoting *United States v. Amodeo*, 71 F.3d 1044, 1050 (2d Cir. 1995)). Thus, the issue is whether “the privacy interests of the defendants outweigh the presumption of public access.” *GoSMiLE*, 769 F. Supp. 2d at 649-50.

Here, the Memorandum of Law contains certain testimony marked Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order by Qin in the Related Case. The parties’ interest in protecting confidential information, specifically sensitive business information that pertains to their clients as well as Qin and Emma Duo Liu’s personal information, overcomes the presumption of access. Indeed, Your Honor has previously granted Plaintiffs’ request to file documents with redactions in the Related Case to protect certain sensitive personal and financial information, which was clearly visible. *See* ECF 112 in the Related Case.

Because the Memorandum of Law contains confidential information of the kind that is deserving of protection and restricting public access, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant their request to redact the Memorandum of Law.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Geoffrey Sant

Geoffrey Sant

Andrew C. Smith

Carol Lee

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

31 West 52nd Street

New York, NY 10019

Tel: (212) 858-1000

Fax: (212) 858-1500

geoffrey.sant@pillsburylaw.com

andrew.smith@pillsburylaw.com

carol.lee@pillsburylaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs/Judgment Creditors

Huzhou Chuangtai Rongyuan Investment

Management Partnership, Huzhou Huihengying

Equity Investment Partnership, and Huzhou

Huirongsheng Equity Investment Partnership

cc: All counsel of record (via ECF)

Application GRANTED. The Clerk of Court is directed to maintain docket entries 74 and 75 under seal, viewable to the Court and the parties only. The Clerk of Court is further directed to terminate the pending motion at docket entry 73.

Dated: April 23, 2024
New York, New York

SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Katherine Polk Failla". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE